Nehru, and he said that it was unfair to label it thus. He said that it was the strongest union in the country, with more than 30,000 permanent members. Its constitution was democratic and it elected a Council, one member of which represents every 100 workers, and from this an executive is chosen. Its leader, Gulzarilal Nanda, he said, knew more about labour than any man in India, but he admitted that his new Bill, which is being discussed in Bombay, would cause bitter dissension. It provides for such elaborate machinery for conciliation that it would be at least four months before a strike could take place, should the owners not accept the decision of the arbitrator. A strike before this would result in the leaders being severely penalised. But, as we shall see, many union leaders feel that they must have the right to proclaim lightning strikes. Of course, there are many features in the Bill which will be welcomed. But great dissatisfaction is expressed with the clause that forbids a strike unless the union represents a membership of 20 per cent, of the total workers. Nehru added that he thought that trade unions were still very weak, and that many of them were little more than *ad hoc* strike committees. He said that Bombay Labour, despite its militancy, was organisationally very weak because of endless ideological disputes among its leaders. It is certainly difficult to achieve unity between those who believe in class struggle and those who believe in class collaboration.

This very inadequate summary gives no idea of the heroic struggles of the Indian working cfcss. Faced with every kind of difficulty—intimidation, espionage, *agents-provocateurs*—there are endless complications and dangers. The full repressive powers of Government have been used to quell disputes, and the workers are so desperately poor that they cannot make contributions, and therefore they receive no strike pay.